UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,766	11/02/2001	Antti Ruha	872.0100.U1(US)	7390
	7590 03/24/200 N & SMITH, PC	EXAMINER		
4 RESEARCH DRIVE			TRAN, PABLO N	
SHELTON, CT 06484-6212			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2618	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/24/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/005,766	RUHA ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Pablo N. Tran	2618
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 December</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 25-38 is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-2, 5-14, 17-24, 39-40, and 43-51 is/a 7) ☐ Claim(s) 3,4,15,16,41 and 42 is/are objected to 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accention and policion to the continuous discontinuous discontinu	are rejected. relection requirement. r. epted or b) □ objected to by the B	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau 	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte

Application/Control Number: 10/005,766 Page 2

Art Unit: 2618

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-2, 5-14, 17-24, 39-40, and 43-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over anticipated Young (6,346,832) in view of Moyer (6,566,911).

As per claims 1, 5-6, 13, 17, and 23, 39, and 43-44, Young disclosed a multi-mode Input/Output circuit for transmitting and receiving data between integrated circuits wherein each IC having at least one of transmitter circuitry (fig. 1/no. 10) and receiver circuitry (fig. 1/no. 12), that are selectively interconnected together by switches to operate as single-ended, voltage mode links, and as a single differential voltage mode link (col. 4/ln. 9-14).

Young disclosed such pair of conductor being utilized as single-ended mode but not explicitly as two single-ended modes. However, Moyer suggested such method (abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide such switching mode, as taught by Moyer, to the Multi-Channeling Apparatus of Young in order provide a flexible interface signaling for an integrated circuit and save cost.

Page 3

The modified communication apparatus of Young and Moyer further disclosed the I/O circuits are constructed of CMOS-based transistors (see Moyer, abstract).

As per claims 2, 14, and 40, the modified communication apparatus of Young and Moyer further disclosed the transmitter sends data to the receiver in another IC over a first conductor and the receiver circuitry receives data from the transmitter in another IC over a second conductor (see Moyer, col. 2/ln. 11-14).

As per claims 7, 18, and 45, the modified communication apparatus of Young and Moyer further disclosed single-ended current mode (see Moyer, col. 5/ln. 16-col. 6/ln. 39).

As per claims 8, 19 and 46, the modified communication apparatus of Young and Moyer further disclosed a single differential voltage mode with single-ended input drive (see Young, col. 3/ln. 56-col. 4/ln. 14, see Moyer, col. 5/ln. 42, col. 7/ln. 30-38).

As per claims 9, 20, and 47, the modified communication apparatus of Young and Moyer further disclosed single differential voltage mode with differential input drive (see young, col. 3/ln. 56-col. 4/ln. 14, see Moyer, col. 4/ln. 21-23).

Application/Control Number: 10/005,766 Page 4

Art Unit: 2618

As per claims 10, 21, and 48, the modified communication apparatus of Young and Moyer further disclosed single differential current mode with single-ended input drive (see Moyer, col. 4/ln. 21-23).

As per claims 11, 22, and 49, the modified communication apparatus of Young and Moyer further disclosed single differential current mode with differential input drive (see Moyer, col. 4/ln. 19-col. 5/ln. 8).

As per claims 12, 24, and 50, the modified communication apparatus of Young and Moyer further disclosed switches are provided to convert said I/O into either transmitter or receiver circuitry (see Moyer, abstract, col. 1/ln. 8-22).

3. Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified communication apparatus of Young and Moyer and further in view of Pena-Finol et al. (5,832,370).

As per claim 51, the modified communication apparatus of Young and Moyer does not specifically teaches that the IC comprises of RF and where at least one of said IC is a base-band IC. However, Pena-Finol et al. teaches such IC (fig. 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide such RF IC, as taught by Pena-Finol et al. to the modified communication apparatus of Young and Moyer in order to provide a compact-cost effective communication apparatus that facilitates communication without interference.

Allowable Subject Matter

Application/Control Number: 10/005,766 Page 5

Art Unit: 2618

4. Claims 3-4, 15-16, and 41-42 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

5. The Applicant submitted a Declaration under rule 131 on 12/16/07 to disqualify Moyer as prior art against the instant Application. However, The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a reduction to practice of the invention in this country or a NAFTA or WTO member country prior to the effective date of the Moyer reference. In this instant application, the Applicant(s) has not presented any concrete evidence for establishing "reasonable diligence to reduction to practice" as required according to MPEP 2138.05-06. Therefore, Moyer is a pertinent prior art.

Conclusion

- 6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pablo Tran whose telephone number is (571)272-7898. The examiner normal hours are 9:30 -5:00 (Monday-Friday). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Urban, can be reached at (571)272-7899. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)273-8300.
- 7. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) System. Status information for

Application/Control Number: 10/005,766

Art Unit: 2618

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Page 6

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-directauspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

March 16, 2008

/Pablo N Tran/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2618